

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been canceled and new independent claim 7 has been submitted herewith. Claims 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been amended to depend from newly submitted independent claim 7. Claim 6 has been canceled.

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it contained more than 150 words. The abstract has been amended to comply with the Examiner's request.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner pointed out that an operation button, speaker, microphone and strobe disposed of the front side lens of the optical portion (claims 3 and 5) were not shown. Also, the Examiner pointed out that the cutoff power supply to the camera in cooperation with movement of the optical portion as specified in claim 6 was not shown. Claim 6 has been deleted to obviate that rejection. However, it is respectfully pointed out that the microphone (8) and strobe (7) are clearly shown in Figure 2 and are described in the specification at page 6, first full paragraph. Claim 5 has been amended to delete recitation of an operation button and a speaker. It is believed that claim 3 reciting the presence of a strobe and sound-collecting microphone is fully supported by the drawings and specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katagiri et al. (U.S. 5,426,478) in view of Mizumo et al. (U.S. 6,334,030) and Nakagawa (U.S. 6, 611,663). As now amended, it is believed that the claims presently in the application avoid this rejection.

Claim 7 has been presented to clearly provide that the optical portion includes a lens and that feature is not present in Katagiri et al. The only part of the Katagiri et al. device which pops up is a strobe, which the Examiner broadly held was an optical portion. That strobe in Katagiri et al. does not include a lens and, therefore, does not teach or suggest what is now clearly recited in claim 7 of the present application.

Similarly, Nakagawa also shows a camera pop-up-strobe unit with a front side Fresnel lens. This is not an optical lens, it merely serves to assist in dissipation of the light emitted from the strobe.

Accordingly, no combination of Katagiri et al. and Nakagawa meets or suggests the limitations now positively recited in newly presented claim 7. The Examiner also applied Mizumo et al. for its showing of an LCD display panel portion 13 mounted at the back of the

camera. While this may be correct, as pointed out above, no combination of Katagiri et al. and Mizumo et al. teaches or suggests that which is now positively recited in newly presented claim 7, since Katagiri fails to disclose a pop-up portion including an optical lens. Thus, modifying Katagiri et al. as suggested by the Examiner by utilizing Mizumo et al. would fail to teach or suggest the combination now claimed.


CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Enclosed is our check in the amount of \$110.00, the requisite fee associated with a one month extension of time to respond to this Office Action. Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Leonard J. Santisi
Reg. No.24,135
(858) 731-5000